

REMARKS**I. Introduction**

Claims 4, 6, 7, 9, 17, and 18 have been examined and rejected. Upon entry of this amendment, Applicants believe that the pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

II. Response to Rejections**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 4 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner believes that the term “personalized catalogs” is a relative phrase. Therefore, the Examiner has characterized the personalized catalogs as “customized wish list and the ability to store multiple wish list.”

Applicants believes that this is a mischaracterization of the phrase “personalized catalogs” and has repeatedly argued this point. First, the claim language specifically states that the catalog is “created from said shopping lists instantly, wherein said personalized catalogs include product information of items within said shopping lists along with an associated barcode.” The term catalog, as used here, refers to a shopping catalog that one would use for ordering products. Such catalogs are commonly distributed by retail organizations to display their items for sale. Thus, Applicants disclose a novel method of creating personalized catalogs (i.e., catalogs which are dynamically created from lists which have been stored by the user). The catalog layout contains product information, such as a picture or description of the product, next to an associated barcode. To stress this point, Applicants have amended claims 4 and 17 to further make this distinction.

The catalogs are considered personalized because the creator of the catalog is able to pick the contents of the catalog. Therefore, Applicants believe that personalized is not a relative term because it differentiates the created catalogs from other catalogs which do not contain information specified by the user.

Applicants therefore request reconsideration of the rejections of claims 4, 6, 7, 9, and 17 because they were rejected using the Examiner's interpretation of "personalized catalogs" and not Applicants' intended meaning.

It should be clear to the Examiner that, upon review, neither Rothschild, Walsh, Knowlton, nor any combination thereof discloses this claim element.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments, arguments and papers filed herewith, it is respectfully submitted that the final rejections should be reconsidered. The Application is now believed to be in a condition for allowance, which is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Olivier Attia
